

REMARKS

Claims 3-19, 22-24 and 26-40 are all the claims pending in the application.

I. Rejection based on 35 USC 103(a)

Examiner has rejected claims 3-19, 22-24 and 26-40 based on a 103(a) rejection.

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection in light of the following arguments and amendments.

In regards to independent claims 22, 36 and 39, Applicant respectfully points out that the newly cited references still require the user to enter a term (in this case a URL), upon which the search for contacts is performed and therefore does not teach the limitation of “identify searchable text elements within the document” as described in the independent claims. The Julien reference explicitly states that it must receive input from the user to identify searchable text elements within the document (see Julien [0030], [0031] and [0033]). Similarly, the Kubota reference also has the same limitation in that it requires the user to input the search term. As indicated by Figure 11 of the Kubota reference, a search prompt is displayed and the user has to input a search term and activate the search by clicking on “Run Search”, “Initialize” or “Erase Results”. On the other hand, according to the claimed invention, the system monitors a currently displayed document and searches for terms appearing within that document, which completely eliminates the need to have a URL input from the user and also eliminates the need of having a user input a search term in a search prompt. Having such a prompt would defeat the purpose of the claimed invention.

Applicant also points out that in the claimed invention when a contact is retrieved, the currently displayed document is not disrupted. On the other hand, in the currently cited art, once


the user enters the URL the currently displayed document is gone and a new document is displayed (i.e. the contact web page that corresponds to the entered URL, see Julien [0069]). To emphasize this point, applicant has amended the independent claims to more explicitly describe this limitation. Because the two combined references do not teach all of the limitations in the independent claims, the rejections on the dependent claims are thus rendered moot.

II. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Bach
Registration No. 37,771

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (650) 625-8100
Facsimile: (650) 625-8110

MOUNTAIN VIEW OFFICE

23493

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 13, 2007